

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no person are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<i>Effective on 12/08/2004.</i> <i>Fees pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (H.R. 4818).</i>		Complete if Known	
FEES TRANSMITTAL		Application Number	10/550,373-Conf. #7961
For FY 2008		Filing Date	June 28, 2006
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27		First Named Inventor	Adalbert Roehrig
TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$ 1,740.00)		Examiner Name	K. Y. Lin
		Art Unit	1725
		Attorney Docket No.	02482/0203338-US0

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)							
<input type="checkbox"/> Check <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Credit Card <input type="checkbox"/> Money Order <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please identify): _____							
<input type="checkbox"/> Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: <u>04-0100</u>		Deposit Account Name: <u>Darby & Darby P.C.</u>					
For the above-identified deposit account, the Director is hereby authorized to: (check all that apply)							
<input type="checkbox"/> Charge fee(s) indicated below				<input type="checkbox"/> Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charge any additional fee(s) or underpayments of fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Credit any overpayments			

FEE CALCULATION							
1. BASIC FILING, SEARCH, AND EXAMINATION FEES							
Application Type	FILING FEES		SEARCH FEES		EXAMINATION FEES		
	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	Fees Paid (\$)
Utility	310	155	510	255	210	105	_____
Design	210	105	100	50	130	65	_____
Plant	210	105	310	155	160	80	_____
Reissue	310	155	510	255	620	310	_____
Provisional	210	105	0	0	0	0	_____
2. EXCESS CLAIM FEES							
Fee Description							
Each claim over 20 (including Reissues) Small Entity Fee (\$) Fee (\$)							
Each independent claim over 3 (including Reissues) 50 25							
Multiple dependent claims 210 105							
Multiple dependent claims 370 185							
Total Claims	Extra Claims	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)	Multiple Dependent Claims			
<u>1</u>	- 20 = <u>1</u> x <u>25</u> = <u>25</u>			Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)		
HP = highest number of total claims paid for, if greater than 20.							
Indep. Claims	Extra Claims	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)				
<u>2</u>	- 3 = <u>2</u> x <u>105</u> = <u>210</u>						
HP = highest number of independent claims paid for, if greater than 3.							
3. APPLICATION SIZE FEE							
If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper (excluding electronically filed sequence or computer listings under 37 CFR 1.52(e)), the application size fee due is \$260 (\$130 for small entity) for each additional 50 sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(s).							
Total Sheets	Extra Sheets	Number of each additional 50 or fraction thereof		Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)		
- 100 = <u>1</u>	/50 = <u>0</u>	(round up to a whole number) x <u>130</u> = <u>130</u>					
4. OTHER FEE(S)							
Non-English Specification, \$130 fee (no small entity discount) Fee Paid (\$)							
Other (e.g., late filing surcharge): 1501 Utility issue fee 1,440.00							
1504 Publication fee for early, voluntary, or normal ... 300.00							

SUBMITTED BY							
Signature			Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	43,040	Telephone	(212) 527-7700	
Name (Print/Type)	Kevin L. Reiner		Date	August 5, 2008			

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Adalbert Roehrig et al.

Application No.: 10/550,373

Confirmation No.: 7961

Filed: June 28, 2006

Art Unit: 1725

For: TUBULAR MOULD FOR CONTINUOUS
CASTING

Examiner: K. Y. Lin

COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

MS Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants submit the following comments on the Examiner's Amendment and Interview Summary accompanying the Notice of Allowability dated July 8, 2008 and mailed July 16, 2008.

The Interview Summary implies that Applicants' attorney agreed during the telephonic interview that the Examiner's amendment was necessary to define over the prior art references of record. While Applicants' attorney did agree to the amendment, he did not agree that the amendment was necessary for patentability.

As Applicants stated in their "Response to Final Office Action Mailed January 11, 2008," filed May 12, 2008, it was Applicants' position that the claims were patentable over the cited art. Claims 1 and 2 as they existed prior to the Examiner's Amendment recited "supporting ribs" that, as also recited, with the supporting shell or supporting plates prevent transverse movement of the copper tube. Therefore, from Applicants' perspective, the Examiner's Amendment merely expressly recited the existing structure of the supporting shell.

Applicant(s): Adalbert **Roehrig et al**
Serial No.: 10/550,373
Confirmation No.: 7961
Group Art Unit: 1725
Filed: June 28, 2006
Examiner: Kuang Y. Lin

Page 2

Docket No.: 02482/0203338-US0

Dated: August 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Kevin L. Reiner/

Kevin L. Reiner

Registration No.: 43,040
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant